

fully come, and the "kingdom of this world" will have become the "kingdoms of our Lord, and of His Christ." Rev. 11: 15.

Read also Luke 12: 37; 22: 30.

Now, dear friends, you who have not as yet accepted this part of the Lord's teaching, please remember that this is no part of the traditions of men. Prayerfully consider the scriptures referred to and the reasons given, and then, do not say as one of old (John 3: 9) "How can these things be?" If Jesus be the author of your faith, let Him also be the finisher of your faith, and of your practice, too. Let his word and his authority be to you the end of all controversy.

Do not reason as one whom I once met and who was trying to show me that it was not necessary to do as Jesus did and commanded in John 13.

After trying for some time to find some sound reason against doing what Christ here plainly said we "should" and "ought" do, he at last concluded by saying, "Well, He never commanded it but once."

My simple reply to him was, "How often does a good child need to be told of his duty?"

Much more might be said, but my time forbids, but I can not close without offering praise to God that he has given to his "little flock" an ordinance that not only represents the equality, unity and fellowship of the saints, but it points us forward to the glorious appearing of Christ when this blessed institution will receive its fulfillment and those of us who are heirs of that kingdom and joint heirs with Him, can sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, to enjoy the fullness of his gracious presence forevermore. Take away this Christian passover and we have no symbol to represent this wonderful and most precious gospel truth, the second coming of the Lord.

The communion does not point us forward to His coming again, but backward to His death on the cross.

Paul says it is to show the Lord's death, I Cor. 11: 26, whereas Jesus has told us that this passover of the gospel, or the supper as it is elsewhere called, is to be fulfilled in the kingdom of God, therefore, we learn that it is an anticipative of our coming Lord and his coming kingdom.

The communion, the cup and loaf, representing His broken body and shed blood on the cross, all this is commemorative; the Lord's Supper, or Christian passover, as some of the primitive Christians choose to designate it, is anticipative in its character.

It is very important, indeed, that we remember His death, but still more important that we be prepared for his coming, and that is why on that last night with his disciples he set up that

double signboard, one arm of which pointing to Calvary, the other to the New Jerusalem, which is to descend after the heavens shall have been opened by our coming Lord of lords and King of kings.

"Blessed are they that do His commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life and may enter in through the gates into the city." Rev. 22: 14.

OUR COLLEGE

P. M. SWINEHART

Much fear is often expressed by some of our ministers and laity lest the "whole gospel" is not universally taught by all our ministers as it should be. But greater fear should be apprehended regarding those who will some time fill our places and are not fully imbued with the precious "faith" we entertain.

It is impossible to efficiently educate such, short of a college of our own.

I might say it is almost accidental for an alien to accept the entire position we hold short of an institution where he may receive the careful instruction necessary.

The question naturally arises, can a young man retain his views of our faith while passing through college elsewhere? I say no. Yet he might but he must be able at the same time to brush aside the bullets that are fired at him from the guns larger than himself, and the coils used are generally beyond his comprehension.

Again, some may question whether such things are ever attempted. In reply to this I shall ask your indulgence in an experience I had on entering a certain college. It so happened two of the leading professors and myself were in the office by ourselves when one remarked: "I perceive you do not belong to our church and so, of course, in your seminary work we will not likely agree on all doctrinal points." "There is baptism, for instance." I replied: "We will agree, professor, to omit that." Then he went on to something else. "You can not draw beneficiaries." I replied that under the conditions I did not ask any. Again he looked at me saying, "if you preach for us you can draw one hundred dollars a year." I replied, I would not.

He still may have thought I did not feel the weight of his inducement and he gave me another dose, saying, "if you will preach for us ten years, or all the time after graduating you can draw at least five hundred dollars from the beneficiary fund during your school work." Not for any consideration, was my reply.

Now then, brethren, of what kind of metal must a young man be made to resist a temptation like that? Going upon borrowed capital as I did, brethren,

what would you have advised me to do then and there? Now, speak, please. Attend that same college, or wait and patronize our own that was yet unborn? If you say the latter I fear it will require another trip to the river to baptize that pocket-book, for I infer the first time you laid it on the bank, judging from the present condition of our college.

Do you apprehend no danger in sending our seminary students elsewhere? If none, then what mean these professors in hammering on this vital point?

Again, why be so inconsistent as some whom I have heard arguing on baptism. In their efforts to sustain it their gestures were wonderful. They stood, they sat, they beat the air, in fact they used "all fours" in the attempt. Then off next Sunday to church and sneakingly drop a penny into the contribution box. How then, if our "faith" is worth fighting for its worth paying for. Hence, my pledge in last week's EVANGELIST. Brethren, we need an endowment as much as we need a college. And if students do not find a chance here equal to that offered in other colleges, they will go where the climate is warmer.

If the editor don't print all this article, I'll write a better one next time.

MR. CAMPBELL AND TRINE IMMERSION

B. F. HALL

(The author of this article, B. F. Hall, is a minister in the Disciple or Campbellite church. The article is meant as a reply to "A Point for Trine Immersion" which appeared editorially on the first page of the "Doctrinal" number of the EVANGELIST, issued more than a year ago. The reader is referred to the editorial "Rejoinder" on page 2 of this issue. Read this article then turn to page 2 and read the editorial. The article was written to brother Jos. I. Hall, brother in the flesh of the author, and by him sent to this office with a request that the same be published with a reply.)

It was stated not long since in these columns in an article entitled, "A Point for Trine Immersion," that Mr. Campbell stated that certain historians traced trine immersion to the times of the apostles.

The quotation made from the edition of 1844 is correct. It is also true that it is not found in the later editions. It is equally as certain that the "Disciples" deny that Mr. Campbell believed that trine immersion was apostolic. This is a typographical error in the edition of 1844. It is so stated by his contemporaries who yet live who ought to be able to tell his belief in regard to the matter. Campbell speaks of immersion and not of immersions. So he and his contemporaries ought to be stronger than a typographical error.

An error of that kind is not so singular. Interpolated passages may be found in the Bible. Errors may also be found, not from God, but from the transcribers. So to attempt to make this a strong point in favor of trine immersion